DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 665 CE 051 371

TITLE Effective Links between Vocational-Technical Education and Private Industry Councils.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Council on Vocational Education, Westerville.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Agency Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; *Demonstration Programs; Disadvantaged; Dislocated Workers; Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; Technical Institutes; Two Year Colleges; Underemployment; Unemployment; *Vocational Education; Vocational Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; Private Industry Councils

ABSTRACT

A study examined a number of local settings in Ohio in which coordination and collaboration between key providers of services under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) were deemed exemplary. Its purpose was to identify elements contributing to successful coordination and collaboration that could be of potential use to others. Researchers interviewed officials of vocational schools, technical institutions, and Private Industry Councils (PICs). They were able to group the hallmarks of exemplary collaboration into three categories--organization, policy and procedures, and specific activities--by the three types of institution. The researchers included both positive and negative findings. They then compiled a composite institution of each type having the features that promote exemplary coordination. Four recommendations were offered for consideration by PICs and service delivery agencies to help them further expand and develop cooperative relationships in the delivery of JTPA agencies. These recommendations addressed criteria for evaluating coordination of services, interagency networks, preservice and inservice, and promulgation of successful strategies. (Interview questions are appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300665

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE051371

Ohio Council on Vocational Education
1988

MEMBERSHIP OF THE OHIO COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Ohio Council on Vocational Education is an agency, separate from the State Board of Education, composed of thirteen concerned citizens representing business, labor, agriculture, education, and various groups with special needs. The Council is dedicated to the concept that vocational-technical education as well as academic education is necessary if Ohio is to be competitive in the national and global economies.

Ohio Council on Vocational Education—FY 88

Mr. Harry Barth
Vice President, Research and Development
The Hygenic Corporation, Akron
Representing Industry
Executive Committee—First Vice Chairperson

Ms. Dianne Biggs
Labor Representative
United Way of Franklin County
Columbus
Representing Labor

Dr. Rosie N. Doughty
Superintendent
East Cleveland City Schools
Representing the Disadvantaged

*__Mr. James C. Drake__
Supervisor, Student Services
Upper Valley JVS, Piqua
Representing Career
Guidance and Counseling
Organizations

Mr. Robert Y. Farrington
Secretary-Treasurer
Ohio State Building and
Construction Trades Council
Columbus
Representing Labor and the Ohio Job Training
Coordinating Council

Dr. Leonard D. Kingsley
Superintendent (Ret.)
Penta County Vocational School
Perrysburg
Representing Special Education
**Executive Committee—Second Vice Chairperson

Dr. Judith A. Maxson
Dean of Technical Education
Hocking Technical College
Nelsonville
Representing Women and Postsecondary Education

Mr. David L. Myers
Supervisor, Student Services
Vantage Joint Vocational School
Van Wert
Representing Career Guidance and
Counseling Organizations
***Executive Committee—Second Vice Chairperson

Ms. Mary E. Purcell
President, Mary Purcell & Associates
Cincinnati
Representing Small Business and the Ohio Job
Training Coordinating Council
Executive Committee—Chairperson

Mr. R. Thomas Scherer
Director (Ret.), Vocational & Technical Training
Toledo Area Chamber of Commerce
Representing Business
Executive Committee—Past Chairperson

Mrs. Helen Scheuring
Agriculturist & Industrial Park Developer
Rock Creek
Representing Agriculture

Mr. Glenn E. Selby
Manager (Ret.), Armco Research Administration
Middletown
Representing Industry

Mr. Saul A. Torres
Admissions Officer
Lorain County Community College
Elyria
Representing Limited English Proficient Students and
Postsecondary Education
Executive Committee—Secretary

Miss Coretha A. West
Teacher, Health Careers Center
Cleveland
Representing Minorities

Staff

Dr. Joseph L. Davis
Executive Director

Dr. James B. Hamilton
Research Consultant

Mrs. Chloe Worley
Executive Assistant

Dr. Martin W. Essex
Executive Director Emeritus

*Mr. Drake was appointed to the Council on March 14, 1988, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Myers.
**Dr. Kingsley succeeded Mr. Myers on the Executive Committee, effective February 17, 1988.
***Mr. Myers resigned from the Council, effective January 4, 1988, when he assumed the position of Assistant Superintendent of Van Wert City Schools.

FOREWORD

Two of the most critical questions facing America today are: (1) How does the nation maintain a skilled and flexible work force? and (2) How do certain groups — including the disadvantaged, the handicapped, minorities, and displaced workers — gain access to employment, retain jobs, advance, and become self-sufficient?

The most common answer to these nagging questions is: through education in the basic subjects, mathematics, and science and training in marketable skills. This view is so widely and deeply held by the American people that it qualifies as an article of faith in an era of vast and accelerating economic change on a global scale.

So far, so good. But when it comes to organizing and activating the means through which education and training are to be achieved, all vestiges of commonality vanish. As is characteristic of so many facets of American society, the response takes many forms, and in more than a few communities it is fraught with debilitating fragmentation and political maneuvering. Much of the response has taken place on three fronts, as follows:

- Vocational programs in secondary schools and technical programs in postsecondary institutions have been expanded greatly during the past 30 years.
- The federal government has mounted a succession of initiatives — including the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and the Job Training Partnership Act.
- The private sector has spawned an array of education and training programs carrying an annual price tag estimated at $40-billion and up.

In enacting the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, Congress took cognizance of the need for coordination between the providers of education and training supported by federal tax dollars. It made State Councils on Vocational Education responsible for assessing the adequacy and effectiveness of coordination between vocational/technical education and services associated with the Job Training Partnership Act.

Pursuant to this charge, the Ohio Council on Vocational Education (OCOVE) authorized a research study during Fiscal 1988 to identify elements that contribute to effective coordination. OCOVE engaged School Effectiveness Trainers, Inc., a Columbus-based consulting firm, to conduct the study. The researchers — Dr. Robert W. Evans, retired Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Ohio, and Dr. James E. Hagerty, retired Superintendent of the Bedford, Ohio, City School District — compiled this report with the editorial assistance of Ms. Frieda Douthitt. The Council is indebted to these three individuals for producing a report that is intended to be useful to vocational/technical educators and JTPA personnel throughout Ohio.

Joseph L. Davis

Dr. Joseph L. Davis
Executive Director

Mary E. Purcell

Mary E. Purcell
Chairperson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iii

BACKGROUND 1

- Two Laws with Parallel Intent 1
- The Need for Coordination 2
- Procedure 3

FINDINGS 6

- Vocational Schools and Centers 6
  - Organization 6
  - Policy and Procedures 7
  - Activities 8
- Two-Year Technical Colleges 10
  - Organization 10
  - Policy and Procedures 10
  - Activities 11
- Private Industry Councils 12
  - Organization 12
  - Policy and Procedures 13
  - Activities 13

PROFILES OF EXEMPLARY COLLABORATING AGENCIES 15

- Exemplary Vocational School or Center 15
  - Organization 15
  - Policy and Procedures 15
  - Activities 16
- Exemplary Two-Year Technical College 17
  - Organization 17
  - Policy and Procedures 17
  - Activities 18
- Exemplary Private Industry Council 19
  - Organization 19
  - Policy and Procedures 19
  - Activities 20

RECOMMENDATIONS 21

APPENDIX 22

REFERENCES 24

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Job-training agencies and vocational and technical schools that do a good job of serving unemployed, underemployed, disadvantaged, and displaced workers are marked by organization, policies and procedures, and activities put in place expressly to foster close cooperation between the two types of agencies.

This study examined a number of local settings in which coordination and collaboration between key providers of services under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) was deemed exemplary. The purpose of the study was to identify elements contributing to successful coordination and collaboration that could be of potential use to others.

From a list of some 20 exemplary agencies submitted by officials of the Ohio Department of Education Division of Vocational and Career Education and the Ohio Board of Regents Two-Year Campuses Division, researchers narrowed their selection to reflect geographic, demographic, and program diversity. They then interviewed officials in five secondary vocational schools, two postsecondary technical institutions, and two Private Industry Councils (PICs) about the extent of their interagency cooperation and the mechanisms for achieving it.

Findings from the interviews allowed the researchers to postulate a composite of each of the three types of agency — vocational school, technical institution, and PIC — and to profile each in terms of the organization, policy and procedures, and activities that contribute to successful interagency coordination and collaboration.

Finally, the researchers offered four recommendations for consideration by PICs and service delivery agencies to help them further expand and develop cooperative relationships in the delivery of JTPA services. These recommendations address:

- Inclusion of criteria for assessing levels of JTPA/vocational-technical education coordination as part of regular evaluations in vocational education planning districts and postsecondary vocational-technical programs.
- Formation of interagency organizations and networks to address common issues encountered in serving JTPA clients.

- Preservice and inservice orientation and training for key personnel in JTPA/vocational-technical education coordination.

- Promulgation of successful local strategies and mechanisms for effective JTPA/vocational-technical education coordination.

BACKGROUND

Two Laws with Parallel Intent

The basic objectives of the JTPA are to prepare economically disadvantaged persons for employment and dislocated workers for re-employment. The purpose of the JTPA, as outlined in Section 2 of the Act, is:

> . . . to establish programs to prepare youth and unskilled adults for entry into the labor force and to afford job training to those economically disadvantaged individuals and other individuals facing serious barriers to employment, who are in special need of such training to obtain productive employment.[1]

Since 1983, the JTPA has provided funding to the states for carrying out this purpose.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (Public Law 98-524),[2] was enacted in 1984. The following four of the nine purposes stated in Section 112 of the Perkins Act relate closely to the purpose of the JTPA:

1. Assist the States to expand, improve, modernize, and develop quality vocational education programs in order to meet the needs of the nation's existing and future work force for marketable skills and to improve productivity and promote economic growth.

2. Assure that individuals who are inadequately served under vocational education programs are assured access to quality vocational education programs, especially individuals who are disadvantaged, who are handicapped, men and women who enter nontraditional occupations, adults who are in need of training and retraining, individuals who are single parents or homemakers, [and] individuals who are incarcerated in correctional institutions.

3. Provide vocational education services to train, retrain, and upgrade employed and unemployed workers in new skills for which there is a demand in that state or employment market.

4. Assist the most economically depressed areas of a state to raise employment and occupational competencies of its citizens.

Common to both federal acts is the fundamental premise that job training and vocational education each have a major responsibility to contribute to the economic health of the nation by developing a competent and productive work force. The two areas that are addressed most directly by both acts are the accessibility of programs of high quality

for particular groups of people and the development of a skilled work force to meet the needs of employers in the state.[3]

The Need for Coordination

In view of the convergence in purpose of the JTPA and Perkins Act, reason holds that significant levels of communication and coordination are necessary among key actors to carry out these purposes efficiently and effectively.

Certainly this was the intent of Congress. The JTPA contains eight specific references to the prevailing vocational education legislation as well as several other provisions to increase communication and interaction between the two systems. The Perkins Act contains 22 specific references to JTPA. Most of these are designed to increase communication and joint planning. In fact, JTPA "eight percent" funds are set-aside funds for coordination activities; Title II-A of JTPA requires states to use their "eight percent" funds for statewide and local coordination efforts.[4]

For the provision of JTPA services, Ohio is divided into 30 Service Delivery Areas (SDAs), each governed by a Private Industry Council (PIC) that is responsible by contract for general policy, monitoring, and local coordination of JTPA service delivery. Each PIC is headed by a board of trustees drawn largely from the private sector. The board is responsible for appropriating funds and overseeing the administration of training programs through its director.

The major providers of services to JTPA clients are comprehensive high schools, joint vocational schools (JVSs), and adult vocational centers, which provide secondary programs under the auspices of the Division of Vocational and Career Education in the Ohio Department of Education; and two-year technical and community colleges, which operate under the auspices of the Two-Year Campuses Division of the Ohio Board of Regents. PICs contract with these educational institutions to purchase training slots on a per capita basis or to offer programs specifically for JTPA clients.

The Perkins Act further stipulates that at least every two years state councils on vocational education are to evaluate the delivery systems assisted under the federal legislation and to make recommendations on the adequacy and effectiveness of coordination that takes place between vocational education and the JTPA.

Recognizing the need for coordination, the Job Training Partnership Services (JTPS) of the Division of Vocational and Career Education in the Ohio Department of Education conducted a JTPA-Vocational and Technical Education Coordination Project in 1986-87. This project, conducted by Joanne Farley Pearsol, involved a mail-out survey which became the basis for the interview instrument for the present study. Pearsol's survey identified the major actors in the employment and training system as including the administrators of the JTPA, secondary public vocational education, and postsecondary vocational or technical education. The project, therefore, identified the types and level of coordination occurring between JTPA SDAs, the Vocational Education Planning Districts (VEPDs), and postsecondary technical education institutions.

Three of the findings of the JTPS project provided major impetus for the Ohio Council on Vocational Education to undertake further study of coordination at the local level. These findings were:

1. That at present, there is a wide disparity in the range of coordination activities occurring between SDAs and VEPDs and between SDAs and technical education institutions;

2. That study respondents generally believe interagency coordination is beneficial and has pay-off for their agencies and institutions; and

3. That there is much higher potential for interagency coordination than exists at present.[5]

Procedure

This study was to examine a number of local settings in which exemplary coordination and collaboration were taking place among key providers of JTPA services and to identify elements that contribute to such success, in the belief that, once identified, these elements could be presented as potentially useful features for consideration by others.

The research team held preliminary discussions with vocational and technical education practitioners; with directors and assistant directors of the Two-Year Campuses Division (Ohio Board of Regents) and the Division of Vocational and Career Education (Ohio Department of Education); and with a board member and board secretary of a PIC not included in the survey.

The purpose of these preliminary discussions was threefold:

1. To gain an introductory insight in the field of study;
2. To discover which local job training agencies state authorities felt exhibited exemplary coordination and collaboration activities; and
3. To become aware of significant organizational, hierarchical, and administrative structures in the Ohio Job Training Partnership Services unit.

On the basis of these early interviews, criteria were established for selecting both the exemplary institutions and individual representatives of those institutions with whom in-depth interviews would be sought. The guiding assumption in the selection of exemplary organizations was that quality services must indicate the presence of cooperation and collaboration. Choices were guided by the opinions and recommendations of State Department officials, who also referred the researchers to the person or persons in each subject institution who could most readily lead them to the factors that make for effective interagency coordination.

The interview subjects included representatives of five secondary schools, two postsecondary institutions, and two PICs. They included:

1. Two PIC directors of planning and evaluation,
2. A dean of a two-year technical college,
3. The associate dean of a two-year community college,
4. An adult supervisor in a joint vocational school,
5. Three adult program directors of major city school systems, and
6. The manager of a program to reclaim dropouts.

Since the purpose of the study was to investigate the success factors in collaboration and coordination among the three types of service providers, it was not considered important for the sample to be representative of <u>all</u> such units. However, selection criteria did include geographic dispersion, population density (urban, rural, suburban), and diversification of services.

One of the secondary schools was a joint vocational school (JVS) that serves a rural area. The other four secondary schools were located in major urban areas. The two postsecondary institutions were two-year colleges, one in an urban setting and one in a suburban area.

The PICs were located in urban areas. They were selected because of their identification with service providers perceived to have exemplary coordination and collaboration activities.

The secondary schools offered a diversity of educational services, including specialized programs. They were located in southwestern, central, northeastern, and northwestern Ohio. The subject organizations, as described by interviewees, represented economically stable locales as well as growth areas.

The researchers had three occasions to gather first-hand information from the interview subjects: first, when they telephoned for interview appointments; second, in face-to-face interviews lasting from one to two hours; and third, in follow-up telephone calls to get data that were not available at the time of the interview.

Through the interviews and observation, the researchers were able to group the hallmarks of exemplary collaboration into three categories: organization, policy and procedures, and specific activities. There is inevitably some overlap in these categories, but in general, organization relates to staffing practices and the assignment of responsibilities; policy and procedures, to explicit or de facto modes of operation; and activities, to the specific forms the collaboration took.

The researchers first grouped the interview findings both by these categories and by type of institution. They included both positive and negative findings since the latter, too, have implications for promulgation and emulation. They then compiled a composite institution of each type having the features that promote exemplary coordination. Finally, they proposed several recommendations as to how the features conducive to exemplary interagency coordination might be shared more widely, to the greater benefit of JTPA clients.

FINDINGS

VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS AND CENTERS

Organization

Responsibility specifically assigned. All vocational educators interviewed were able to identify specific personnel responsible for coordination of JTPA services. On average, two persons are responsible for coordination of services in each of the five schools. Their titles:

- Director;
- Director, program coordinator, and director of planning, development, and evaluation;
- Director, all program supervisors, and coordinator of support services;
- Supervisor and JVS superintendent; and
- Director and governor of PIC board.

Shared board membership. With only one exception, vocational school personnel sit on PIC boards and PIC personnel sit on vocational education advisory committees or craft committees. Such interchange encourages coordination in a variety of ways:

- Better understanding of funding and programming procedures;
- Incentive for school administration to "push" for cooperation in delivery of services and proposal development; and
- Greater input on program needs and internal problems such as dropouts.

In one instance, the involvement of the JVS superintendent led to the funding of a summer skills development program that otherwise might not have occurred.

Other operational and organizational structures. Also contributing to collaborative success were:

- Use of Title III funds of the Perkins Act;
- Joint attendance by personnel of both agencies at state workshops designed for vocational inservice;
- Cooperative efforts in proposal development; and, in one case,
- A separate, autonomous instructional governing board that helped focus on students at risk and provided high expectations for client success.

Policy and Procedures

Open communications are a common element in the promotion of coordination. Cited as salient factors were:

- Board of education governance as a unifying force;
- Making the meeting of PIC needs an organizational priority;
- Open door policy of the project supervisor;
- Ease of client access to program; and
- A sense of common goals among major parties at all levels.

Deliberate strategies used to overcome impediments include:

- Increasing the number of meetings for role clarification;
- Providing for one-on-one communications; and
- Systematizing a feedback process.

One interviewee told of relocating state Bureau of Employment Services (OBES) personnel from the established state office to overcome the "welfare stigma" that inhibited clients from participating.

Other formally structured policies that enhanced collaborative efforts included:

- A personnel experience requirement that included PIC involvement;
- Job descriptions for all staff members;
- School board involvement in budget and management;
- A national curriculum that offered consistency and accountability; and
- A director who functioned under both board of education policies and PIC requirements, resulting in more effective and efficient operation.

Activities

Joint planning, funding, and evaluation of programs, without exception, were characteristic of the exemplary systems. So were reciprocal referral, intake, and assessment procedures for JTPA clients and technical education students. With only one exception, the participating schools reported coordination on financial agreements, contracts, subcontracts, sharing of databases, and interagency committees.

Technical assistance is an effective avenue of coordination. Vocational schools receive technical assistance from other agencies in the areas of job specialization and employment strategies; funding to offset tuition costs for non-PIC services; and staff training by local state university personnel, by Planned Parenthood, and by local industry personnel.

Vocational schools lend various types of technical assistance to other agencies:

- Workshops and assessment services for private industry and government agencies, including Veterans Administration and Industrial Commission, school personnel and potential employers;
- GED programs; and
- State advisory committee services.

Particularly good examples of technical assistance to other agencies are special workshops, assessment services, and job-placement training.

Beneficial outcomes of coordination far outweighed problems. Among the beneficial outcomes were:

- General help to the local economy via increased employment and earnings;
- Funding of a computer-assisted instruction program in an adult vocational center;
- Assured continuation of the program due to satisfied clients;
- Improved assessment efforts;
- Greater numbers served (because the vocational school helps in identifying potential clients and screening them for PIC eligibility, as well as referring them to PIC);
- PIC personnel growth on the job; and
- A tendency for PIC funding overall to increase.

On the negative side, however, respondents from at least two schools cited inadequate attention to:

- Written agreements on nonfinancial topics;
- Sharing joint JTPA client data or having common management systems;
- Joint reciprocal staff development meetings;
- Joint reciprocal technical assistance activities; and
- Staff exchange and shared location.

Among the complaints from vocational school representatives were that job placement responsibilities are not shared enough and that PIC promotional costs are borne by the vocational school.

A variety of bureaucratic requirements impeded coordination, the vocational school interviewees reported. These included:

- Not understanding all JTPA guidelines;
- PICs changing operational plans in midstream;
- Too many public and private agencies involved in PIC programs; and
- Too much red tape in registering clients.

One interviewee pointed out that problems arose from the failure of PIC and its locally-elected official governing entity to work together smoothly. One vocational school found that PIC tended to drop programs for insufficient numbers of clients, resulting in loss of clients and program funding to the vocational school.

TWO-YEAR TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Organization

Shared board membership. Personnel of both of the technical colleges surveyed sit on local PIC councils. Respondents report that "this factor has encouraged coordination through visible involvement that is interpreted as a positive presence." It has:

- Aided in the resolution of problems at PIC;
- Motivated follow-up of clients; and
- Maintained an objective role for PIC.

One technical college reports that local PIC board members or staff serve on college advisory and craft committees. This representation has aided in communicating professional attitudes toward work, skill development, and race and sex issues.

Policy and Procedures

Supportive environment. The two technical colleges were split between "very supportive" and "somewhat supportive" in describing college attitudes toward coordination with PIC. They were divided between "very interested" and "somewhat interested" in reporting personnel attitudes toward increasing or improving coordination.

No befuddlement. The technical colleges reported that the following factors have helped them to promote PIC coordination:

- Not allowing themselves to be "befuddled" by PIC;
- Strong negotiations;
- Entering and promoting positive relationships;

- Meaningful participation through board-level representation;
- Equipment donations to PIC; and
- Being philosophically attuned to private enterprise education.

Other operational and organizational structures with the potential to contribute to collaborative success include knowledge of the bureaucracy and the fact that the financial aid officer negotiates individual client contracts.

Personalities of the administrators and the role of PIC as a collaborative agency are significant elements in successful coordination of activities. In fact, one technical college spokesperson stated that administrative style and charisma are the most important factors involved.

Activities

Joint planning, operation, and evaluation of programs take place with both technical colleges and their PICs. Moreover, both colleges engage in:

- Reciprocal referral procedures for JTPA clients and technical students;
- Financial agreements, contracts and subcontracts;
- Sharing of databases; and
- Interagency committees and exchange of staff.

Cited as particularly valuable coordination strategies are:

- Administrators serving as "buffers" between agency personnel, and
- Utilization of individual training contract concepts with clients.

Beneficial outcomes outnumbered the detriments. Among the benefits are:

- Better service to both agencies' clients;
- High student performance and strong student leadership;

- Development of a sense of community service;
- Commitment to making coordination work for clients; and
- Strengthening of the technical program.

On the negative side, the technical colleges agreed that coordination with their PICs is hindered by educators' lack of understanding about services and administrative roles at PIC. Not enough attention is given to instructing technical college personnel about PICs' goals and tasks. One interviewee indicated that a major impediment is the personal ambition of the PIC director, who is perceived as engaging in "empire building." Red-tape "hoops" and matching-fund requirements were reported as problems, especially when "lower-level" personnel coordinated programs and activities.

The technical college respondents noted several detriments to coordination:

- The amount of paperwork involved;
- Determining which agency has client scheduling responsibilities;
- Allocation of laboratory time for equipment use; and
- A generally bureaucratic mentality and red tape.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCILS

Organization

Responsible authorities. Both PICs in the survey identified several authorities responsible for coordination of services. They were:

- Operations manager, treasurer, and associate executive director; and
- President, community coordinator, director of operations, and contract officers.

One PIC indicates it has representatives on both vocational school and technical college advisory groups; one PIC uses school personnel on its advisory and craft committees. Both PICs considered the interchange of representatives an important element in the

promotion of coordination, along with educational administrators' understanding of PIC operations and JTPA administrative regulations, and commitment to service.

A mission statement, one PIC finds, is a useful device for sharing of information between the PIC and its service providers. The mission statement specifies that delivery of services is the responsibility of the PIC.

Policy and Procedures

Contract proviso. One of the PICs reports as helpful a provision in its contract with its local elected official (LEO) agency that the PIC is the sole recipient of grant funds and administrator of those funds on a nonprofit basis. This PIC has total oversight and budget responsibility; no political entity signs off on the budget.

Other operational and organizational structures in the PICs that have potential for collaborative success are:

- Specialization of staff as "experts" in their assigned areas of responsibility;
- Staff cooperation and knowledge of service providers' strengths and weaknesses; and
- An administration that favors and encourages finding the best providers of services to clients.

Activities

Joint funding, operation, and evaluation of programs are features of both PICs, though both report that joint evaluation of programs is not occurring adequately. Other cooperative endeavors are:

- Reciprocal referral procedures for JTPA clients and technical education students;
- Sharing of databases and common management systems;
- Joint reciprocal staff development events; and
- Exchange of staff and joint board membership.

Technical assistance is a major opportunity for collaboration. One PIC received technical assistance from the National Center for Research in Vocational Education and from Occupational Work Adjustment personnel in school systems. One PIC provides technical assistance to the local Chamber of Commerce, Adult Providers Consortium, and County Services Committee.

Benefits outweigh negatives, from the PICs' point of view, as well as the educational agencies'. Collaboration yields:

- Overall improvement of contract performance;
- Shared information; and
- Problem resolution.

Negatives cited by the two responding PICs include the time frame for completion of work and the bureaucracy imposed on both PIC and the educational agencies by government regulations, reporting timelines, and the like. However, impediments are seen as a fact of life; PICs work with and through them.

Neither PIC reported programs designed to train or retrain displaced workers under joint funding or joint operating conditions. One PIC finds that its encroachment into programs of the service provider is a potential detriment to coordination.

PROFILES OF EXEMPLARY COLLABORATING AGENCIES

EXEMPLARY VOCATIONAL SCHOOL OR CENTER

Organization

At least two of the school's administrators have responsibility for coordinating activities between the school and PIC. All personnel in the school have been informed of the importance of such coordination, and efforts are made to assure that positive attitudes toward collaboration with PIC personnel and programs prevail. Appropriate inservice toward this end is the responsibility of the administrators in charge.

The director assumes the lead in "modeling" behaviors that depict positive attitudes. He establishes high expectations for all personnel under his jurisdiction that further assures such behaviors. He emphasizes such activities as:

- Providing reports to the board of education about the outcomes of successful collaboration;
- "Showcasing" the outcomes; and
- Including PIC personnel in the reporting process.

All administrators and staff are responsible for developing and maintaining channels of communication with PIC administrators and staff. Reciprocal involvement on advisory groups, on planning committees, in the identification of clientele, and in program planning and evaluation is expected and encouraged. The vocational school or center that wants to guarantee continuity of coordination and collaboration makes high-ranking personnel available for appointment to the PIC board.

Policy and Procedures

Written policies, procedures, and regulations that govern the long-range plans and day-to-day operations of the schools cover not only legal and contractual arrangements, but

employment as well, giving the staff appropriate balance in race, sex, and national origin to reflect the community served. Other topics covered include:

- Exchange of staff with PIC;
- Sharing of equipment and facilities with PIC;
- Providing after-hours instructional schedules and personnel required to meet PIC staff and clients' needs;
- Skill-improvement opportunities for PIC staff by school personnel; and
- Job descriptions for school employees.

In addition, reciprocal referral procedures for clients have been established and are modified as circumstances and economic conditions change. School officials encourage the development of joint intake and assessment procedures for clients as well. Contracts and subcontracts for program offerings with agreed-upon outcomes are developed to insure effective training opportunities for clients.

Activities

The school collects and shares with PICs and other agencies, in timely and appropriate ways, data concerning:

- Job-market needs;
- Demographic changes;
- Socio-economic shifts;
- Program costs;
- Job-placement issues;
- Private contracting opportunities; and
- Local, state, and federal funding sources.

The school supplements the expertise of its own staff by constantly seeking technical assistance from PIC personnel; appropriate state offices; and local businesses, industries, and service agencies. Then the school involves PIC personnel in the activities that

have been arranged. Funding comes from sources regularly available to the school and from sources available to PIC. For funding purposes, the school has developed, with the involvement of PIC personnel, an inventory of services and programs needed on a priority basis.

Coordination is achieved through concrete arrangements between school and PIC officials. Collaboration in proposal writing for program funding is considered essential for the success of both agencies. The school makes available personnel with special skills in proposal writing for the PIC's use.

The director and his administrators meet regularly on an informal basis with their PIC counterparts to establish open and positive communications, to head off possible problems, and to air concerns before they develop into major issues.

EXEMPLARY TWO-YEAR TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Organization

High-level organization structures within the college that facilitate coordination include:

- Placing college personnel as advisors on PIC boards and committees;
- Encouraging PIC personnel to serve on task forces and in other advisory capacities at the college; and
- Involving staff from both institutions in collaborative problem-identification and problem-solving assignments.

Policy and Procedures

The two-year technical college that is successful in coordinating activities with PIC has developed an institutional environment that is very supportive of educating and training clients who need job-placement opportunities. It is not committed exclusively to those who are pursuing an associate degree, certification, or academic preparation for a four-year college degree.

College faculties and PIC personnel frequently are not attuned to the difference between the objectives of postsecondary instruction and those of a job-training agency. This is compensated for by a style of leadership and commitment that clarifies the missions of both institutions.

Although the matching-funds requirement may affect the ability or inclination of college departments to conduct meaningful programs with PIC, the college doesn't let this requirement prevent it from taking advantage of JTPA "eight percent" monies. The same can be said of Title II-A funds.

College administrators work through PIC and state bureaucratic impediments to negotiate contracts for programs and services that are useful to their clients and beneficial to the communities they serve.

Activities

Coordination is achieved through collaborative arrangements in such areas as the development and evaluation of present programs and the planning of future programs. Other examples of coordination include:

- The reciprocal referral of clients;
- Developing financial arrangements that provide access to college or PIC services;
- Exchanging data regarding job markets, economic trends, demographic changes, and funding sources;
- Sharing facilities and equipment; and
- Exchanging staff.

College personnel are available to PIC for:

- Proposal writing,
- Technical assistance,
- Inservice training, and
- Long-range planning and policy development.

EXEMPLARY PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL

Organization

The PIC that is successful in coordinating activities with the local vocational school and technical college has given its director and other administrative personnel responsibility for establishing collaborative relationships with designated school and college personnel. Its authorities understand and appreciate the bureaucratic milieu in which these agencies operate and recognize the statutory limitations placed upon them.

The PIC has negotiated a contract with the service delivery agency that provides for the widest range of autonomy possible within the limitations of the social and political environment in which it functions. At the same time, it makes the fullest possible use of the school's professional and political expertise by placing its representatives on the PIC governing board, various task forces, and planning committees. PIC representatives also serve on the school's governing board and advisory committees.

The PIC strives to establish common management systems with its service delivery agencies and promotes the exchange of staff for training purposes and management assistance.

Policy and Procedures

The PIC director, with the governing board, has developed written policies and regulations that govern the organization's day-to-day operations and long-range objectives. Included in these documents are provisions for:

- Program and employee performance evaluation;
- Employment guidelines, including patterns for establishing and maintaining staff balance in race, sex, and national origin;
- Legal and contractual agreements;
- Facility and equipment use;
- Exchange of staff for instructional and advisory assignments; and
- Job descriptions for all employees.

PIC personnel overcome impediments to the effective coordination of activities with their service delivery agencies by exploiting opportunities to share in problem-identification and problem-solving work sessions. At times, personnel from service delivery agencies are involved in these sessions.

PIC authorities achieve coordination through arrangements and agreements that facilitate:

- Joint funding, operation, and evaluation of programs;
- Reciprocal referral procedures; and
- Sharing of data about job-placement needs and economic and demographic changes, client profiles, and eligibility requirements for clients.

Activities

Every opportunity is exploited for the exchange of information and for using such information in PIC operations. This is accomplished through:

- Internal strategy meetings;
- Administrative memos; and
- Exchange of documents with appropriate service delivery agency personnel.

Coordination is enhanced through the use of "experts" from service delivery agencies and state personnel who can provide technical assistance. The PIC also utilizes personnel from local businesses and service institutions, including private and public four-year colleges and universities.

In addition to JTPA "eight percent" funds, Title II-A funds, and Title II-B funds, the PIC is able to use JTPA discretionary funds for programs and projects of mutual benefit to PIC and the service provider. (Title II-B funds are for special summer training programs.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations presented below were made by the researchers as a result of the findings and insights obtained in the course of the study. Originally, the recommendations were addressed to the Ohio Council on Vocational Education in the belief that the Council might wish to act on the recommendations in pursuing its leadership role.

The Council is of the opinion that these recommendations merit the consideration of all others — be they individuals, organizations, or governmental agencies -- who bear responsibility for strengthening vocational/technical education in Ohio.

The recommendations are as follows:

1. Criteria for evaluating coordination of services. The Ohio Department of Education Division of Vocational and Career Education and the Ohio Board of Regents Two-Year Campuses Division should consider developing criteria to assess levels of coordination between their constituent agencies and local PICs for the effective delivery of services to JTPA clients. For vocational education, these criteria could be incorporated in the PRIDE (Program Review for Improvement, Development, and Expansion) format.

2. Interagency networks. Vocational schools and centers, two-year technical colleges, and PICs should consider establishing formal interagency organizations within their service delivery areas to address common issues related to delivery of services to JTPA clients. The State Department of Education and Board of Regents should consider instituting a network of educational agencies and PICs to address this function on a statewide level.

3. Preservice and inservice. Preservice orientation and inservice programs for instructors, administrators, and supervisors in vocational schools and centers, two-year technical colleges, and PICs should include opportunities to study strategies, mechanisms, and benefits of interagency collaboration and coordination of services to JTPA clients.

4. Promulgation of successful strategies. The Division of Vocational and Career Education and Two Year Campuses Division should coordinate the identification, development, and promulgation of examples of successful local collaboration strategies to appropriate personnel in vocational schools and centers, two-year technical colleges, and PICs throughout the state.

APPENDIX

Interview Questions

1. Who is responsible in your agency for coordination between your operation and your [PIC, service provider]?

2. All things considered, what factors have been most helpful in promoting coordination between your agency and your [PIC, service provider]?

3. All things considered, what factors have most impeded coordination between your agency and your [PIC, service provider]?

4. What, if anything, have you and your personnel done to overcome these impediments?

5. Does anyone from your agency sit on any local [PIC, vocational or technical education] board, advisory council, or craft committee?

6. Please specify ways this representation has encouraged coordination.

7. Please identify [from accompanying table] several possible types of coordination that presently exist between your institution and your [PIC, service provider]?

8. Are any coordination activities that you perform missing from [the accompanying] table?

9. Please list any types of technical assistance your agency receives from other agencies.

10. Please list any types of technical assistance you provide other agencies.

11. Please list the types of technical assistance you mentioned above that you think serve as particularly good examples of coordination.

12. Did you apply for JTPA "eight percent" funds or respond to RFPs for JTPA "eight percent" funds? In program year '85? '86?

13. What was the total amount of JTPA "eight percent" funds you received? In '85? In '86?

14. Has the matching-funds requirement as established by law had any effect on the coordination process?

15. Did you apply for Title II-A funds or respond to RFPs for Title II-A funds (excluding "eight percent" funds)? In '85? In '86?

16. What was the total amount of Title II-A funds (excluding "eight percent" funds) that you received? In '85? In '86?

17. Did you apply for Title II-B funds or respond to Title II-B RFPs for program year '85? '86?

18. What was the total amount of Title II-B funds that you received for program year '85? '86?

19. Please describe the training or retraining of displaced workers by program(s) that are targeted to this purpose that your operation funded jointly or operated jointly with your [PIC, service provider].

20. Please describe the beneficial outcomes of coordination between your operation and your [PIC, service provider].

21. Any detrimental outcomes?

22. Would you say that the benefits outweigh the detriments?

23. What provisions exist in your policies or procedures that formally structure collaborative efforts that may be missing in other operations of this type?

24. What other operational or organizational structures exist in your agency that you think should be mentioned that may contribute to collaborative success?

Asked of technical colleges only:

1. In general, how supportive is the environment in your institution toward coordination between your institution and your PIC?

2. In your opinion, how interested are your PIC personnel in increasing or improving coordination with your institution?

3. Some people feel coordination between institutions may be hampered by a lack of understanding by educators of service and administrative roles in job-training agencies like PIC. Do you agree or disagree?

4. Please describe any suggestions you have for your local PICs that might improve coordination between your two agencies.

Asked of PICs only:

1. Are there any specific provisions in your LEO [local elected official] agency contract that facilitate collaboration that may be unique to your operation?

REFERENCES

1. Congress of the United States. Job Training Partnership Act (Public Law 97-300), 97th Congress, 1983.

2. Congress of the United States. Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (Public Law 98-524), 98th Congress, 2nd session, 1984.

3. Washington State Council on Vocational Education. Vocational Education - Job Training Partnership Act Coordination. Olympia, Washington: Washington Council on Vocational Education, 1987.

4. Lewis, Morgan V.; Ferguson, Marilyn; and Card, Michael. Vocational Education-Job Training Partnership Act Coordination: First Annual Report. Columbus, Ohio: the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1987.

5. Pearsol, Joanne Farley. JTPA Vocational and Technical Education Coordination Project: Final Report. Columbus, Ohio: Job Training Partnership Services, March, 1988.

Non Profit Org.
Permit #434
U.S. Postage
Westerville, OH 43081

Ohio Council on Vocational Education
750 Brooksedge Boulevard, Suite 105
Westerville, Ohio 43081